

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

March 21, 2000 LB 936

Schimek, you might not have been in the Chamber earlier when we announced that the cookies were on behalf of your birthday today. And so let's take this opportunity to wish Senator Schimek a happy birthday. Further discussion on the Beutler amendment to the committee amendments to LB 936? Senator Matzke, followed by Senators Coordsen and Chambers.

SENATOR MATZKE: Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor. First of all, I appreciated Senator Beutler giving me a heads up on this motion to amend. And I've had a chance to analyze it. I'd just like to respond. The original bill did not contain a sunset provision. The sunset provision was inserted in this bill by the Revenue Committee and is part of the committee amendments. Quite frankly, I would be happy if the whole paragraph were not included in the bill. But nevertheless, the sunset provision is in the bill or in the committee amendments which become the bill. Part of his motion seeks to strike from the sunset provision the wording "without further authorization of the Legislature". And I've had an opportunity to inquire into that, and I find that that language is actual...was actually in LB 829, back in 1995. And that's where that language came from, and so there is some precedence for using that type of language. His amendment would also seek to change the word from "filed" to "approved". I'm advised that the word "filed" is the word that is generally used, because that is a definite date which is not dependent upon some action of approval. So when the application is filed, it's a definite date. It may take a short time or a long time after that to get it approved, and that the draftsmanship that went into the committee amendments used the word "filed" as they have used in similar bills. Now on the general policy issue of these bills, and I'll address this in greater detail later on, this bill is a completely different bill than Senator Wehrbein's bill. Senator Wehrbein's bill, as I understand it and as I read it, is more a marketing bill. It creates and provides funds to set up co-ops and organizations that can market agricultural commodities. This bill, LB 936, is not really an ag bill. There are not really any direct benefits under this bill for agriculture. It is a community bill, it is a jobs bill, it is a balancing of the benefits that the metropolitan area gets out of LB 775, and extends those benefits to smaller communities. You can't get the benefits of LB 775 unless you add at least 30 jobs and meet a high criteria of